From: carylun
Sent: Mon, 11 Aug 2025 07:27:46 +0000
To: cope_assistant@publicationethics.org
Subject: Re: Concerns raised to COPE about the handling of submissions to the journals Studia Logica and Foundations of Physics

Dear Ms Puebla,

I acknowledge receipt of your reply regarding my concerns about the editorial handling of my manuscript.

I understand that COPE does not interfere with editorial decisions and that desk rejections are considered acceptable under your current guidelines. However, I must point out that, for many authors — especially independent researchers — your name (Committee on Publication Ethics) and your public mission statement create a legitimate expectation that you will protect authors from opaque editorial practices, including rejections issued without substantive feedback.

When a manuscript is rejected without any scientific examination and without transparent reasons, it is not merely a matter of "editorial style" but a barrier to fair scientific discourse. Such practices risk eroding public trust in scholarly publishing, and the lack of recourse only reinforces the perception of a closed system.

I regret that COPE's remit does not allow you to address this issue substantively, but I believe that the gap between your stated mission and the limits of your action is a matter worth public discussion. I will therefore be mentioning this situation in my upcoming outreach work on scientific ethics, as an example of systemic limitations in current publication governance.

Best regards,
Xavier J. Régent
Independent Researcher

-------- Message d'origine --------
Le 09/08/2025 11:31, Iratxe Puebla a écrit :
Dear Dr Régent,

I am writing regarding your submissions to COPE about the handling of your manuscript submissions to the journals Studia Logica and Foundations of Physics. I have looked over the submissions and I am writing to let you know that they do not fall within the remit of what the Facilitation and Integrity can review.

COPE's role is primarily to provide advice for member editors and journals and to promote a better understanding of publication ethics. COPE considers concerns raised in relation to member journals, but our review of any case is focused on the process followed by the journal; we do not interfere with editorial decisions such as those for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript. More about the scope of the Facilitation and Integrity subcommittee is available at

our FAQ: https://publicationethics.org/facilitation-and-integrity/submitting-complaint-against-cope-member-faq.

I understand that you have concerns about the fact that the manuscripts were rejected without peer review. COPE recognizes that the peer review process may take place in different models in different journals, and does dictate that peer review beyond internal editorial assessment should happen for all manuscript submissions, as a result, a desk rejection without external review is not a deviation from COPE guidance. The decision for rejection is editorial in nature, and beyond the scope of what COPE can review.

The concern you raised does not fall within the remit of what COPE can look into and thus, we cannot pursue it further. I am sorry that we cannot assist on this occasion.

Thank you for raising this matter to the attention of COPE.

With best wishes,

Iratxe
Iratxe Puebla
Facilitation and Integrity Officer
Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)
www.publicationethics.org
Registered charity No 1123023
Registered in England and Wales, Company No 6389120
Registered office: COPE, New Kings Court, Tollgate, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO53 3LG, UK